APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg	NL040009	5252

24737   7590   09/01/2009
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
JOHN, CLARENCE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/597,047	BRONNENBERG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLARENCE JOHN	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2009*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *13-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *13-27* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth

in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

6/15/2009 has been entered.

Status of Claims

This action is responsive to the RCE filed on June 15, 2009 where the applicant

cancelled claims 1-12 and added New Claims 13-27. Claims 13-27 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/15/2009 have been fully considered but they are

    not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for allowance.

2. With respect to Claim 13, the Applicant argues that Theriault's filtering and

    querying steps are not independent from one another and Theriault fails to

    disclose a content directory is searchable or browseable to enable a review of

    said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by at least of

    network rendering device.

3. In reply, the Examiner states that Theriault's filtering and querying are
   independent from one another. (Column 3, lines 35-42; Column 4, lines 50-55.
   Here the information exchanged does not pass through the proxy which is
   independent. Per Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17, the query and response
   cannot be rendered to the network device- Browser, because the user selects
   the filtering of services which is also independent from each other). Also,
   Theriault teaches storing of filtered response including all or parts of the modified
   response in the storage 330. (Column 6, lines 1-7, Column 7, lines 17-22);
   Theriault further teaches modification (filtered modified response) which can be
   used for future reference by the browser (i.e. searching or browsing the content
   directory to review filtered information, Column 8, lines 55-58).

4. Also, Therialut was never relied upon periodic filtering. However, Hughes
   teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40,
   lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan
   interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering
   set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering /
   attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the
   information). Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers
   and devices. According to the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co.
   v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S - 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have been obvious

to combine the use of known technique, that is filtering of information on servers
and devices, by combining the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by modifying
the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering
and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-12. are Cancelled.

6. Claims 13, 17, 19, and 22 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
   unpatentable over Theriault et al. (US 6,049,821) in view of Hughes et al. (US
   6,065,055).

7. With respect to Claim 13, Theriault teaches a method of filtering and storing
   information about content stored on at least one network device and accessible
   via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network
   rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprising:

8. a) filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of

    content (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17)   that cannot be rendered by at

    least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices;

    (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be

    rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering

    of services. i.e. filtering said information);

9. b) storing in a content directory the filtered information devoid of content that

    cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device; (Column 7,

    lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy

    server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

    And;

10. c) searching or browsing the content directory to review said filtered information

    devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering

    device; (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response

    cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser., because the user selects

    the filtering of services which is independent from filtering and querying. Column

    6, lines 1-7, Theriault further teaches modification (filtered modified response)

    can be used for future reference by the browser (i.e. searching or browsing the

    content directory to review filtered information, Column 8, lines 55-58).

11. wherein said searching or browsing of the content directory is independent of

    said filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of

content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device.

(Column 3, lines 35-42; Column 4, lines 50-55. Here the information exchanged

does not pass through the proxy which is independent. Per Column 5, lines 6-9

and lines 13-17, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network

device- Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services which is also

independent from each other).

12. Theriault teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However,
Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

13. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.
(Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-
17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is
the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes
further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-
57. i.e. filtering the information).

14. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It
would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by
modifying the teachings of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically
filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

15. With respect to Claim 17, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitation as described in Claim 13 above.

16. However, Therialut does not explicitly state about said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is repeated over a "predefined time interval".

17. Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Hughe's teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval of 5 minutes, Column 5, lines 10-12).

18. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by modifying the teachings of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

19. With respect to Claim 19, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to claim 13 wherein said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is performed where a new network rendering device is added to the network. (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17. Column 7, lines 17-

23, lines 55-58. Here, the user device selecting the filtering services is the new

device entering the network).

20. With respect to Claim 22, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to

claim 13, further comprising selecting content for transfer via the network to the

at least one network rendering device, (Theriault's teachings on Column 4, lines

4-9); wherein said selecting is based on the searching or browsing step,

(Theriault's teachings on Column 8, lines 55-58, i.e. searching or browsing the

content directory to review filtered information); and wherein said content

selected for transfer is renderable by the at least one network rendering device.

(Theriault's teachings on Figure 1, Browser 100 is the network device).

21. With respect to Claim 23, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to

claim 13, further comprising filtering information about the content to yield filtered

information including content (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and

lines 13-17); that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device

of the plurality of network rendering devices, (Theriault's teachings on Column 5,

lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to

the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services.

i.e. filtering said information);

22. and making available on the network said filtered information including content

that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device. (Theriault's

teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified

response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the

information in a file system).

23. Theriault and Hughes teach the limitation of Claim 23 as described above.

However, Therialult does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic

filtering.

24. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.

(Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-

17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is

the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes

further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-

57. i.e. filtering the information).

25. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by

modifying the teachings of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically

filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

26. With respect to Claim 24, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to

claim 23, further comprising initiating an action based on said filtered information

including content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering

device, wherein the action comprises **any** of the following:

a) upgrading the network; b) downloading and/or installing a codec;

27. c) adapting a security parameter;   (Theriault's teachings on Column 2, lines 29-

36. Here the Proxy server provides security feature to the network);

28. d) recommending the purchase or upgrade of at least one network rendering

device; and e) providing a human-perceptible explanation of why content is

unusable by the at least one network rendering device.

29. With respect to Claim 25, Theriault teaches a device adapted for filtering and

storing information about content accessible via a network, said content being

potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering device adapted for

rendering content, the device comprising:

30. a) at least one filtering element adapted to filter information about the content to

yield filtered information devoid of content (Theriault's teachings on Column 5,

lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) ; that cannot be rendered by at least one network

rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Theriault's

teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response

cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects

the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information); and

31. b) a storage element containing a content directory including the filtered

information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by said at least one

network rendering device;   (Theriault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23,

lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system);

32. wherein the content directory is searchable or browseable to enable review of said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device, (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser., because the user selects the filtering of services which is independent from filtering and querying. Column 6, lines 1-7, Theriault further teaches modification (filtered modified response) can be used for future reference by the browser (i.e. searching or browsing the content directory to review filtered information, Column 8, lines 55-58); and the content directory is searchable or browseable independently of said periodic filtering by the at least one filtering element. (Column 3, lines 35-42; Column 4, lines 50-55. Here the information exchanged does not pass through the proxy which is independent. Per Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device- Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services which is also independent from each other).

33. Theriault teaches the limitations of Claim 25 as described above. However, Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

34. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

35. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by modifying the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

36. With respect to Claim 26, Theriault and Hughes teach a media server embodying the device of claim 25. (Theriault's teachings on Figure 1, Proxy Server 200).

37. With respect to Claim 27, Theriault and Hughes teach a network comprising the device of claim 25 (Theriault's teachings on Figure 1, Network comprising the Proxy Server 200) and at least one network rendering device (Theriault's teachings on Figure 1, Browser 100).

38. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US
2003/0023671)

39. With respect to Claim 14, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as
described in Claim 13. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 13,
wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering
device of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content having a
format (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, the
query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser,
because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

40. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings about the
content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

41. Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation. Abdulrahiman
teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices.
Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not compatible with the
network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph
[0039], lines 3-5).

42. Therialut, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the
servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in
the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of
Therialult, Hughes and Abdulrahiman by modifying the teachings of Theriault

and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to

the destination by following certain supported data formats.

43. With respect to Claim 15, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as

described in Claim 13. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 13

wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering

device of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content

(Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, the query and

response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the

user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

44. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content

having a transport protocol, which is not compatible with the network rendering

devices.

45. Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation.   Abdulrahiman

teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices

Abdulrahiman also teaches about a content having a transport protocol. (Page 3,

paragraph [0030], lines 6-11, Paragraph [0031], lines 5-8. That is, electronic

information transmitted between remote source and proxy via wireless / wire

connection must have a transport protocol).

46. Therialut, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the

servers and devices.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of

Abdulrahiman with Therialult and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

47. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

48. With respect to Claim 16, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13.

49. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

50. Conversely Safadi does in fact teach such a limitation. Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2, paragraph [0021, lines 1-2).

51. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Therialult, and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.

52. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).

53. With respect to Claim 18, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network.

54. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

55. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Conversely Gorman does in fact teach such a limitation. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Therialult and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

56. With respect to Claim 20, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Also, Theriault and Hughes teach a method of filtering (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing

information about content is performed (Theriault's teachings on Column 7,
lines 17-23, lines 55-58) ; for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on
Figure 10, Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).

57. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about filtering which is
performed when a network device has been removed.

58. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also
teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is
removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4
A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter
cells).

59. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and
devices. Conversely Gorman does in fact teach such a limitation.   Gorman
teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data.   It would have been
obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made
to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Therialult and Hughes and
modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and
filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

60. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Theriault and Hughes in further view of Cheng (US 2002/0078161).

61. With respect to Claim 21, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13.   Theriault also teaches the information about the content which is stored by content directory service. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

62. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings wherein the network is a UPnP network.

63. Conversely Cheng does in fact teach such a limitation.   Cheng teaches about network communication over server and devices in a UPnP network. (Page 2, paragraph [0018], lines 1-5. Figure 1).

64. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices over a network. Cheng teaches about network communication in a UPnP network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Cheng with Theriault, Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by employing a UPnP network which is self configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and controlling other devices.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443
8/25/2009
/Tonia LM Dollinger/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443